



#16  
3/4/04

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Docket No: Q56006

Tsugio OKAMOTO

Appln. No.: 09/406,803

Group Art Unit: 2666

Confirmation No.: 1953

Examiner: Mehra, Inder P.

Filed: September 28, 1999

For: ADDRESS CONVERTER FOR GATEWAYS INTERCONNECTING NETWORKS OF  
DIFFERENT ADDRESS FORMATS

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RECEIVED

MAR 01 2004

Technology Center 2600

Sir:

Please review and enter the following remarks summarizing the telephone interview  
conducted on January 27, 2004:

REMARKS

An Examiner's Interview Summary Record (PTO-413) was mailed to Applicant dated  
February 6, 2004.

A telephone interview, initiated by Applicant's representative, was conducted on January  
27, 2004 between Examiner Inder P. Mehra, of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office and  
Applicant's representative, Andrew J. Taska.

The purpose of the interview was to discuss the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-10 as  
set forth in the Office Action dated September 11, 2003. Specifically, the interview was limited

**STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW**  
**U.S. APPLICATION NO: 09/406,803**

**Attorney Docket No: Q56006**

to a discussion of U.S. Patent No. 5,956,335 to Backes *et al.* (hereinafter "Backes") and the Examiner's grounds of rejection for claims 1-10 citing the Backes reference.

No exhibits or demonstrations were provided and no amendments were proposed. The following substantive arguments were made with respect to the claim rejections of the Office Action:

- (1) The functional address and the multicast address disclosed in Backes do not, respectively, conform to different address formats.
- (2) The functional address disclosed in Backes is never used for routing purposes in any network.
- (3) The functional address disclosed in Backes is not rewritten with the multicast address. Consequently, two-way communication is impossible according to the system disclosed in Backes.


However, Applicant's representative and the Examiner were not able to reach agreement with respect to the Examiner's prior art rejections.

**It is believed that no petition or fee is required.** However, if the USPTO deems otherwise, Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee, except for the Issue Fee, for such extension is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

**STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW**  
**U.S. APPLICATION NO: 09/406,803**

**Attorney Docket No: Q56006**

Respectfully submitted,



---

Andrew J. Taska  
Registration No. 54,666

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 26, 2004